

May 14, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

sion, but on mutual respect and a common belief in the dignity of man."

Out of a terrible war, he continued, "the Nation was preserved. It ended here 100 years ago. Now our task is to bind the wounds, and to it in unity, to build the America begun but never completed."

HUMPHREY was introduced to the audience by Gov. Dan K. Moore following ceremonies in which Representative HORACE KORNNEGAY, of Greensboro, extended greetings.

JORDAN SPEAKS

Senator EVERETT JORDAN spoke briefly, telling the crowd the Vice President is interested in North Carolina's Research Triangle area as a suitable place for advancing the research programs of the Federal Government.

William A. Creech, of Smithfield, representing Senator SAM J. ERVIN, said the Senator had asked him to say he was disappointed.

"He told me," said Creech, "he wanted me to extend a personal, warm welcome to one he holds in the highest esteem, his former colleague in the Senate, the Vice President.

Samuel T. Morgan, whose grandfather gave the Bennett Place property to the public for a historic shrine, spoke on behalf of the family asking for "the development of a spirit of unity, without differences of birth or creed."

Morgan came from the Bahamas to speak of the Bennett Place preservation as "the fulfillment of a dream of my grandfather."

R. O. Everett, chairman of the Bennett Place Centennial Commission, said the agreement at Bennett Place has come to symbolize a spirit of unity, without differences to make the occasion as meaningful for the coming century as the last occasion, a century ago."

The Vice President predicted the South will help lead the way in the fight to overcome ignorance, disease, poverty, and injustice.

He said the South "is forging ahead with a pace of economic developments that is the wonder and the envy of every section of the country."

Noting that the Civil War was the costliest this Nation has ever fought, HUMPHREY said "too often the reenactment of historic battles tend to make war romantic.

"War is not romantic. War is ugly, cruel, and senseless. We are not gathered here today to commemorate a war—not are we gathered here to commemorate the end of a war. We are here to pay tribute to the valiant men of the North and the South who met 100 years ago at Bennett Place to seek peace."

The Vice President told the crowd, "what a shame it was that all of our country at that trying time could not have agreed with the words of Robert E. Lee at Appomattox: 'We have fought this fight as long and as well as we know how * * * for us * * * there is but one course to pursue. We must accept the situation * * * and proceed to build up our country on a new basis.'

[From the Durham Sun, Apr. 26, 1965]

"GRATEFUL," SAYS EVERETT OF HELP

"I'm very pleased. We made it a national event."

This comment was made today by R. O. Everett, chairman of the Bennett Place Memorial Commission, as he looked back on yesterday's centennial program at the historic homestead.

The silver-haired Everett, who has served as a member of the Bennett Place Commission since it was created in 1921 and as its chairman since 1925, was visibly tired.

He had spent a busy day with Vice President and Mrs. Hubert H. Humphrey, who delivered the principal address at the ceremonies commemorating the final surrender of the South in the Civil War at Bennett Place.

Nevertheless, his pride at having been a part of the ceremony, which had received national attention, was still apparent.

Everett, the man many regard as the primary force behind Bennett Place's emergence as a site of national historic significance, sat in the cushioned rocker in his office and tossed bouquets to those who "contributed" to the success of the centennial.

"I'm very grateful to the city, to the centennial committee, to the donors, to those who made the facilities available for the program and all those who've helped (the Bennett Place Memorial Commission) over the years," he said.

He also expressed his gratitude to Gov. Dan Moore for entertaining "our guest" during the weekend and to Duke University for its luncheon honoring the Vice President prior to the centennial ceremony.

"That luncheon was a magnificent contribution," he said.

C. H. Pattishall, who directed arrangements for the ceremonies, was singled out by Everett for his contributions.

The 86-year-old attorney praised the "devoted efforts of individuals," saying "I just couldn't attempt to mention them all because I'd be afraid I'd leave someone out."

However, he did manage to cite his wife and son, Robinson Everett, for their work on the centennial.

Commenting on the centennial program and its significance, Everett said, "I think we have established the historic fact that the Civil War ended at Bennett Place and made it public knowledge. I just hope the occasion justified itself in the minds of the public."

He said the events should make the historic homestead "of ever-increasing interest to tourists."

Concerning the future plans for Bennett Place, he mentioned the possibility of establishing a museum at the site.

However, he added, "I don't think I'll undertake that myself. There's enough momentum now that the public can take it over and make into a State or national park."

[From the Durham (N.C.) Herald, Apr. 26, 1965]

HIS THEME WAS UNITY; HIS CHARM, UNIVERSAL

(By Paul Fogelman, Herald city editor)

The man in the uniform of a Confederate officer pushed his way through the crowds to extend his hand to Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

Both exchanged greetings.

The Vice President pushed on through the crowds to the speaker's stand about 125 feet from the reconstructed Bennett Place farmhouse. And the man in the Confederate uniform, known to have been an officer in the Durham Ku Klux Klan, was wearing a wide smile.

Some 30 minutes later HUMPHREY was stressing unity and warning against the senseless, vengeful kind of extremism. The crowd of some 4,500, gathered for the 100th anniversary of the Bennett Place surrender, broke into spontaneous applause.

It was at the Bennett Place, a small farm about 4 miles west of Durham, that Gen. Joseph E. Johnston, surrendered the last large contingent of Confederate troops to U.S. Gen. William T. Sherman.

During his tour of the Bennett Place grounds, Vice President HUMPHREY chatted with E. C. Gunter, Sr., of Durham.

"My daddy was right here * * * he laid down his arms right here," Gunter told the Vice President. "He was enlisted in Johnston's cavalry," Gunter continued.

"Did you hear that, Governor?" HUMPHREY exclaimed, turning to Gov. Dan Moore. "Here's a man who says his father was here for the surrender."

"That's really something," Governor Moore acknowledged and reached forward to shake Gunter's hand.

With Mr. and Mrs. R. O. Everett, of Durham, as official guides, Vice President and

Mrs. Humphrey, Governor and Mrs. Moore, U.S. Senator and Mrs. B. Everett Jordan, and other members of the party toured the Bennett farmhouse, kitchen, and smokehouse.

"There's no ham in the smokehouse," Mrs. Moore joked.

HUMPHREY stopped to read every word of every marker. And at several intervals he appeared to lapse into a somber pensive mood with very few words.

Everett, who served as chairman of the Bennett Place Committee for 43 years, spoke briefly before the major address by HUMPHREY. His words and those of the Vice President ran in parallel lines.

Everett stressed that the event commemorated 100 years of peace. He said the event was not intended to recall war.

HUMPHREY, too, spoke in this mood. "War is not romantic. War is ugly, cruel, and senseless," he said.

"We are not gathered today to commemorate a war—nor are we gathered to commemorate the end of a war. We are here to pay tribute to the valiant men of the North and the South who met 100 years ago here at Bennett Place to seek peace."

As a climax to the event—one which had been planned and promoted with boundless energy by the silver-haired Everett—came a special ceremony at a hastily called press conference.

The Vice President presented Everett with a commission, signed by Kentucky Gov. Edward T. Breathitt, naming Everett as a Kentucky colonel.

After the brief ceremony and words of appreciation to the press, HUMPHREY and Governor Moore turned to leave. But enthusiastic mobs of young and old handshakers surged forward and encircled the Vice President to the chagrin of Secret Service agents.

Finally, with the Ft. Bragg Post band blaring marches, the Vice President eventually made his way to No. 1 limousine and was accompanied by Governor and Mrs. Moore to the Raleigh-Durham Airport where the jet was waiting for the return trip to Washington.

"It's been quite a weekend," the Vice President commented. He waved at the crowd, took one prolonged look at the small farmhouse and monuments and took his seat beside the Governor.

Soon the Bennett Place was quiet again.

[From the Charlotte (N.C.) Observer, Apr. 25, 1965]

BENNETT PLACE—TWO GENERALS MADE HISTORY IN NORTH CAROLINA HOME; JOHNSON SURRENDERED TO SHERMAN IN CIVIL WAR 100 YEARS AGO

(By A. C. Dunn, Observer staff writer)

DURHAM.—A few decades ago the late unpleasantness was the cornerstone of recorded southern history.

Yankees cynically mimicked reverent southern mention of "the Wo."

To southerners, Gen. Joseph E. Johnston was Joe and Maj. Gen. William T. Sherman was blank blank.

The Bennett House near Durham where the North Carolina surrender was signed, doubtless enjoyed almost as much widespread historical recognition as the U.S.S. Missouri does today.

For most southerners now, the war conjures only memories of grandfather's sword "somewhere in the attic" or of grandmother, who wouldn't carry a Lincoln penny in her purse; or of some dim ancestor who never officially surrendered until he was in his 80's, and did so then only because he wanted to vote.

"Dixie" still brings a southerner to his feet, sometimes a lump to his throat, and the Stars and Bars are familiar. But the rest of the relics are vague in the minds of all but experts.

Not many people see the Bennett house unless they go looking for it in the country near Durham, and though its significance is carefully explained on bronze plaques, the emotion of the place has generally gone cold.

IT WASN'T DRAMATIC

It is not a dramatic place. It was not a dramatic surrender.

At Appomattox Courthouse there was a final parade, the ritual of stacking arms, Lee's farewell address to his troops, lots of emotion.

At the Bennett house Johnston sat with Sherman in a sparsely furnished farmer's room, and after considerable discussion they signed an agreement. The Bennett children and their mother waited, wide eyed, in a log outbuilding, and a few Confederate and Union officers and orderlies mingled quietly outside under a big white oak tree by a well. No fanfare.

The original Bennett house burned on October 12, 1921, and was not restored until 1960. Now three unpainted buildings, the dwelling, the kitchen, and the smokehouse, stand in the open at the corner of a large park about 5 miles west of the center of Durham. The old Hillsboro Road runs around the corner, past a stone wall. One small gate leads through the stone wall, and the buildings are surrounded by a rail fence.

A monument, two pillars supporting a stone with "Unity" carved on it, stands outside the fence. Bronze plaques explain what happened there, and inside the house are pictures of Sherman and Johnston, maps, antique furniture, the usual somebody-stopped-here trappings.

MEMORIES REMAIN

The clapboard walls of the house, the sawed notches of the kitchen's logs, the cement between the logs, the brass locks on the doors, the huge stone chimneys, the round-ended shingles, all look not exactly new, but at least recently weathered.

Across a little stretch of old gravel road a pavilion stands under trees near the site of the old Bennett well. The white oak and the well are gone. People thirsting instead for immortality have carved on the pavilion timbers: "Don Hockaday loves Ramona," "Otis and Sybil." A couple of rusty oil drums hold picknickers' leavings and trash. On the bronze plaque beneath the "Unity" stone someone has scratched in commas where the syntax of the description of the surrender is unclear. The commas help.

The place is open only on weekends. The lower window panes of the house are smeared from the foreheads of weekday visitors peering into the dim rooms.

On U.S. 70 several hundred yards north a small sign points to Bennett Place, but from a distance the innocent passerby would never dream that in the house 100 years ago tomorrow two generals, one tall and distinguished looking and the other red-haired and untidy, agreed to end all "acts of war."

WORST OF TIMES

Unlike Dickens' description of the French revolution, April 1865, in North Carolina was the worst of times, and that was all. Bentonville had been fought. Sherman's army was camped around Smithfield. Most of the remnants of Johnston's army were near chaos in Greensboro, and soldiers were deserting by the thousands. Jefferson Davis was headed southwest, trying to avoid capture, forlornly hoping the South would rise again.

Johnston didn't want to fight because he was vastly outnumbered, and he knew the war was lost. Sherman didn't want to fight because he and his officers dreaded the long pursuit march they knew would result from forcing Johnston into battle.

Lee surrendered to Grant. Jefferson Davis was finally persuaded to let Johnston negotiate with Sherman for peace. The morning of April 17 Johnston set out from Hillsboro on

horseback. Sherman from Raleigh by train. At Durham Station Sherman switched to horse and started toward Hillsboro escorted by a detachment of cavalry.

More was on his mind than the surrender: he had just received shocking news, and had sworn the Raleigh telegraph operator to secrecy, afraid that his troops would destroy Raleigh in revenge if the news leaked out about Lincoln's assassination, 3 days earlier.

GENERALS CONFER

The two parties met near Durham, and "a small farmhouse" a short distance back toward Hillsboro was agreed on as a meeting place. Lucy Bennett let the two generals use the main room of the house.

They talked all afternoon, while their escorts passed time congenitally in the shade beside the well. No conclusion was reached, but they met again the next day and drew up an agreement.

President Andrew Johnson subsequently rejected Sherman's proposed surrender terms, insisting that Johnston be given the same terms Grant had given Lee. At his third meeting with Sherman in the Bennett house on April 28, Johnston objected to this: Lee's soldiers had been sent home without arms, food or money, and consequently had been a menace to civilians along their way. Johnston did not want his soldiers pillaging and stealing as Lee's had done.

But a bargain was struck. Johnston's soldiers were provided with rations, were allowed to keep some of their arms, and also were allowed to keep their own horses and to use what military horses and mules remained (deserters had been stealing them). Sherman later took steps to help civilians, particularly farmers, get back on their feet.

Johnston actually surrendered 36,817 troops in North Carolina, and 52,453 troops in Georgia and Florida. Some small units and many individuals did not surrender for years, and Confederate troops in Texas did not surrender with Johnston, but to all intents and purposes the war ended in the South at the Bennett house.

THE WAR WE ARE UNPREPARED TO WIN

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, in recent weeks I have addressed the Senate in a series of statements in which I have drawn from items currently appearing in the press, to illustrate the need in the United States for establishment of an institution for research and training, similar to what is proposed in the freedom academy bill. In this connection, I refer to pages 4059, 4751-4753, 5276-5281, 6382-6387, 7599-7603, and 8508-8515 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

This bill, S. 1232, is cosponsored by a diversely based group of Senators representatives of the whole United States. The sponsors, besides myself, are Senators CASE, DODD, DOUGLAS, FONG, HICKENLOOPER, LAUSCHE, MILLER, PROUTY, PROXIMIRE, SCOTT, SMATHERS, MURPHY, and, newly joining us, FANNIN.

The bill proposes the establishment of intensive research into the new discipline of nonmilitary warfare. Concurrently offered would be extensive training of three distinct groups of persons—American Government employees whose work concerns international relations; citizens of foreign countries which may be targeted by the new-type aggressor powers for nonmilitary aggression, and who desperately need sophistication in this little known, but highly effective, technique of aggression, in order to defend their own

societies from outwardly stimulated collapse; and persons from our own private sector—Americans who, although not employed by the Government, are employed abroad in work which is closely associated with the conduct of international relations.

Of the three groups, if forced to select the one most critically needing careful training in this discipline, but who cannot obtain it outside the Communist bloc, I would designate the foreign nationals as the priority group. These are persons who will preserve their own countries' sovereignties if they are to be preserved. Besides mounting their own countries' defenses against nonmilitary aggression, these persons provide some of our own defense. It is in our own interest to help preserve their countries' national sovereignties as entities which are not hostile to us. We have intense mutual interest.

Establishment of a freedom academy was urged more than a decade ago for priority attention. The driving individual behind the idea was a Florida attorney who had interested himself in psychological warfare during World War II. He is Alan Grant, of Orlando, Fla. After organizing a study and drafting committee, he had the concept formulated, and then presented it to high national security officials in Washington in 1954—11 years ago. Weeks later, he wrote as follows to the Operations Coordinating Board, to inquire about progress:

Nearly 4 weeks have passed since the OCB conference * * * and we have not yet received a decision. Nearly 5 months have passed since the plan was initially sent * * *.

In our planning, we are ever conscious of the Communist timetable. Our estimate of the situation (in 1954) fills us with urgency.

One of our group has been a student of partisan or guerrilla warfare for a number of years. He believes, and we believe, that Mao's concept of revolutionary warfare based on the village is the most important military-political concept of our times. We are witnessing (in 1954) an expert application of Mao's theories in Indochina, and they will be repeated in the near future in Thailand (it has already begun near the Malaya border), Burma, India, and other underdeveloped areas where the village is important. The only possible way that a Mao-type war can be won by the free world in a backward area is by winning the villages ideologically and organizationally first—with superior cadres. Such cadres can best be developed by a leadership group of the type we propose to train at the academy. Such work can only be carried on by convinced, dedicated men and women who have acquired many special skills * * *. In a Mao-type war, material superiority is of secondary importance (as demonstrated by American bombs dropping all too often on empty jungles with little effect other than frightening the animals in this late year of 1965). The primary ingredient is guts and operational know-how of a new type. We feel that many of us are refusing to face the hard realities of a Mao-type war, and lack the conviction and staying power to wage the battle for the villages. Then none of us have had the advantage of academy training.

This is one of the many reasons why we believe that our plan should be acted on at once.

That was 11 years ago. Since then, "Mao type wars" have commonly occurred in Africa; they are occurring in

May 14, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

10173

Latin America; and they are conducted so successfully in southeast Asia that many Americans advise the President to order withdrawal of American forces, since the indigenous governments appear unable to rule, and seem to be unrepresentative of the people.

We still have done virtually nothing, however, to provide the political education needed by leaders of these target societies. We are not certain about exactly what is going on. This is because we face antagonists who benefit from a generation of intensive study in the new discipline of nonmilitary aggression, while we have preferred to deny it substantial attention.

Our Government does acknowledge more readily now than in earlier years the existence of the discipline. Recurrences of revolutionary patterns are recognized to some degree. But our attention is superficial and, unfortunately, somewhat haphazard in the selection and utilization of trainees.

In December, the New York Times described the main effort in our Government to provide political training for its own employees. William E. Burrows was the author of the article concerning a 4-week course conducted at the Foreign Service Institute, in Arlington, Va. He wrote:

In a 4-week course, called the National Interdepartmental Seminar, senior civilian officers from at least four U.S. agencies engaged in activities abroad are taught about political, economic and internal defense problems in new nations * * *.

A spokesman for the seminar explained the purpose as the training of oversea personnel to [be] more acute observers of the countries they are sent to, and to be able to spot problems there and take preventive action by coordinating their efforts.

Six seminars are given a year each with 50 to 80 selected students.

So, Mr. President, each year since 1962 we have been providing between 300 and 480 Government officers with barely minimal training in nonmilitary warfare. That is a small number when compared with the State Department officer personnel roster alone. The State Department recruits nearly that many new junior Foreign Service officers each year; and it is a pitifully small number, compared with the tens of thousands of Americans in uniform who now are trying to pick up the pieces and to provide a defense against communism in Vietnam.

But worse is the necessary superficiality of a month-long course in a whole academic discipline. A Latin American, as I shall indicate presently, can obtain thorough training in any of several Communist-bloc countries. Their courses ran up to 3 years, for senior cadres. That is 3 years spent in training for the offense, while our senior officials—limited to our own Government, alone—spend 1 month in training for defense. In this game of nonmilitary warfare, as with most other games, defense is the more difficult job.

Mr. Burrows continued, in discussing the breadth of the 4-week course.

The course work covers practically the entire range of problems arising in new nations. Some representative lectures include: "The Rise of Insurgency," "Communist Tech-

niques of Infiltration and Subversion"; "The Role of Youth in Developing Societies"; "Public Opinion and Political Power"; "The Requirements and Limitations of Force in Countering Insurgency"; "The Role of the Police in Developing Areas," and "Radio in Developing Areas."

The course is divided into parts. One part, called the Threat * * * is an examination of the theories and methods used by the Communists and other revolutionary groups to undermine established authority.

Students read the theories of national liberation wars by Mao Tse-tung, and other Communist tacticians of guerrilla warfare.

The last part, the U.S. response, ends the course by examining ways in which the various U.S. agencies can act to thwart insurgents who use subversion, sabotage, and open warfare to threaten young nations. The accent is on interagency cooperation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MUNDT. I ask unanimous consent that I may have additional time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I do not intend to deprecate this effort. I commend it. But I call attention to its utter inadequacy. It is decidedly a minor league effort to win a big league contest.

I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "U.S. Aids Study Tactics of Reds," written by William E. Burrows, and published in the New York Times of December 20, 1964, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. AIDS STUDY TACTICS OF REDS; SENIOR OFFICIALS ATTEND A SEMINAR IN ARLINGTON

(By William E. Burrows)

ARLINGTON, VA.—The lower floors of a modern apartment building here, once intended to accommodate two nightclubs, have been turned into a school where high-ranking U.S. Government personnel are taught how to counter subversion and guerrilla warfare in developing nations.

A guard is posted where a doorman would have stood if the rooms had fulfilled their original purpose. Students and faculty members must pick up identity tags at the entrance where a hatchet concession might have been.

Photographs of revolutionaries such as Fidel Castro, Chou En-lai, Patrice Lumumba, and Gamal Abdel Nasser line corridors that were designed to lead into lavish rooms for dining and dancing.

Works on guerrilla warfare, subversion, and Communist tactics by Karl Marx, Mao Tse-tung, Maj. Ernesto Che Guevara, and other Communists, as well as those by Western specialists, fill shelves in a room that might have housed a bar if the planners of the building had not found out that Virginia outlaws serving liquor in public places.

In a 4-week course, called the National Interdepartmental Seminar, senior civilian officers from at least four U.S. agencies engaged in activities abroad, are taught about political, economic, and internal defense problems in new nations.

The students represent such Federal departments as the Foreign Service, Department of Defense, U.S. Information Agency, and the Agency for International Development.

A spokesman for the seminar explained the purpose as the training of oversea personnel to be more acute observers of the countries they are sent to, and to be able to spot problems there and take preventive action by

coordinating their efforts. The seminar was started 2 years ago by order of President Kennedy.

Six seminars are given a year, each with 50 to 80 selected students. These are senior Government officers, such as chiefs of mission, consuls, military attachés, ambassadors, and information service and foreign aid directors stationed in developing nations in Africa, Asia, the Middle East, and Latin America.

HIGH-PAID FACULTY

The faculty is the highest paid in the world, according to the spokesman. Lecturers include university professors specializing in area studies, generals, ambassadors on home leave, and even Assistant Secretaries of State, such as Walt W. Rostow, the Chairman of the State Department's Policy Planning Staff.

Mr. Rostow lectures on the coordinating function of the State Department in U.S. missions abroad. When possible, the seminar brings in any lecturer the students wish.

The course work covers practically the entire range of problems arising in new nations. Some representative lectures include: "The Rise of Insurgency"; "Communist Techniques of Infiltration and Subversion"; "The Role of Youth in Developing Societies"; "Public Opinion and Political Power"; "The Requirements and Limitations of Force in Countering Insurgency"; "The Role of the Police in Developing Areas"; and "Radio in Developing Areas."

The seminar is divided roughly into three parts. The first, called the Development Process, deals mainly with the traditional societies in developing nations, and how those societies have been affected since World War II.

Area specialists from universities and Government officers lecture on the roles of various groups within these nations, such as the youth, military, businessmen, and intellectuals. The purpose here is to give the students a general understanding of these nations and problems caused by westernization.

THREAT IS ANALYZED

The second part, called the Threat, is an examination of the theories and methods used by the Communists and other revolutionary groups to undermine established authority.

Students read the theories of "national liberation" wars by Mao Tse-tung, Ernesto Che Guevara, Gen. Vo Nguyen Giap, the North Vietnam Defense Minister, and other Communist tacticians of guerrilla warfare.

The last part, the U.S. Response, ends the course by examining ways in which the various U.S. agencies can act to thwart insurgents who use subversion, sabotage, and open warfare to threaten young nations. The accent is on interagency cooperation.

The students are organized into groups called "country teams," which are the counterparts of real ones overseas. A country team is made up of the senior officers of each U.S. agency in a country. It usually includes the Ambassador, chief military attaché, information service and agency directors, and the heads of any other agencies present.

The country team concept was started in an effort to promote greater cooperation in information gathering and policy implementation.

Country teams meet at regular intervals to exchange information and combine to formulate unified ways of carrying out policy. This is supposed to cut down on duplication of information gathering and often contradictory or uncoordinated policy implementation.

PROBLEMS SIMULATED

Country teams in the seminars are given problems simulating real ones, and are expected to use what they learn in the seminar to make policy and plan ways to carry out that policy.

May 14, 1965

Since each member represents a different agency, heavy accent is placed on cooperation. Cases dealing with trouble spots such as the Congo, Cyprus, and South Vietnam are sometimes hypothetical, but usually are taken from actual situations.

There is also a practical side to the seminar. During the middle of the course, the class goes on short field trips to the U.S. Army Special Forces School at Fort Bragg, N.C., and the Special Warfare School at Eglin Air Force Base in Florida. At Fort Bragg they are briefed on antiguerrilla fighting by "green beret soldiers," many of whom are veterans of the war in South Vietnam.

South Vietnam is regarded as an unsuccessful example of the type of situation the seminar is set up to develop. The gains made by the Vietcong among the civilians through terror and propaganda point up the dichotomy between what is learned in a seminar room and what may be put into practice under field conditions. This is partly why Vietnam is given slightly more emphasis than any other country studied in the seminar.

"The war in Vietnam," a seminar official explained, "will go one way or the other on any given day, depending on how the average peasant feels when he gets up in the morning. We are, therefore, trying to get through to these people."

"The greatest threat to the independence of developing nations is the lack of communication between the governments and the people," he said. "That is caused by illiteracy, and for that reason the transistor radio is potentially our best weapon."

The staff member explained how complex the overall picture is citing a small example of the type of problem U.S. oversea personnel try to solve.

"The Bolivian Army has more doctors per individual than does the rest of the population. But by and large, soldiers are the healthiest people around, so why not send some of the army doctors out among the civilians?" he asked.

That kind of a solution would be the product of a military man and an Agency for International Development specialist working together, perhaps as part of a country team. The accent is on cooperation, and in theory it has been found to work.

In practice, the first results of the seminar effort seem to be mixed, but as in all long-range social and political experiments, time will be the ultimate test.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, a more recent item published in the New York Times indicates that we are perhaps too late in becoming more mindful of our obligation, as the greatest non-Communist power in the world, to train foreign nationals in political sophistication. This is an unsigned Associated Press dispatch from South Vietnam, published on April 25:

The men closest to the war in South Vietnam still believe it must be won from the ground. * * * The immediate danger is still the Vietcong team in the hamlet a few hundred yards down the canal.

For more than 6 years, Government forces have been battling the Vietcong, but control of much of the nation has slipped into enemy hands. A major part of the problem is psychological, many top officials now believe. Vietcong * * * political forces have generally been closer to the people.

Vietcong political warfare techniques have been so successful that a handful of South Vietnamese and U.S. officials have started experimenting with them.

In 12-day cycles, specially selected trainees from the South Vietnamese Government militia are going through a course openly modeled on Communist teaching methods. Concentrating on political warfare, it is taught in the home hamlets.

"We must not steal, we must not damage homes and crops, we must not rape their women, and above all, we must be just in everything we do."

All this sounds like Communist guerrilla doctrine, and the instructor himself may be a former member of the Vietcong.

Skilled Vietnamese political instructors have been hard to get, and the Americans have done most of the recruiting.

I ask unanimous consent that the Associated Press dispatch entitled "Saigon Men Study Vietcong Tactics," published in the New York Times of April 25, 1965, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SAIGON MEN STUDY VIETCONG TACTICS: POLITICAL WARFARE TAUGHT TO MILITIA IN 12-MAN "CELLS"

XABINH TIEN, SOUTH VIETNAM. May 1.—Blazing tropical sunlight slanted through palm fronds this week on a seated circle of heavily armed men listening to a cell leader.

Cell meetings like this are nothing new in Vietnam. The Vietcong have made them a key part of their training program.

But these were government militamen, and the cell lecturer was picked by the Saigon government, not by North Vietnam.

The men closest to the war in South Vietnam still believe it must be won on the ground. While bombing of the North may be helpful in the long run, the immediate danger is still the Vietcong team in the hamlet a few hundred yards down the canal.

For more than 6 years, government forces have been battling the Vietcong, but control of much of the nation has slipped into enemy hands. A major part of the problem is psychological, many top officials now believe.

Vietcong troops are often more dedicated and better disciplined than government men. Vietcong military and political forces have generally been closer to the people.

Vietcong political warfare techniques have been so successful that a handful of South Vietnamese and U.S. officials have started experimenting with them. Sometimes these officials seek to adopt Vietcong methods of controlled terror, including the assassination of Communist officials by special death squads.

Other experiments, including the one being carried out here in the Mekong Delta, are aimed at stiffening the combatants' psychological spine.

In 12-day cycles, specially selected trainees from the South Vietnamese Government militia are going through a course openly modeled on Communist teaching methods. Concentrating on political warfare, it is taught in the home hamlets.

Each group of 88 men is called a "loyal model platoon." Each platoon is broken down into three cells of 12 or 13 men each. The leaders of these double as military squad leaders and political cell leaders.

"The soldier must live, eat, and work with the people," the instructor says.

"We cannot survive without good intelligence from the people."

"We must not steal, we must not damage homes and crops, we must not rape their women, and above all, we must be just in everything we do."

All this sounds like Communist guerrilla doctrine, and the instructor himself may be a former member of the Vietcong.

These political instructors get "6 months of the best kind of training," an American official said.

EXPERIMENT RUN BY FIVE

The ultimate object is to put all 160,000 militamen in the country through some kind of political course. These militamen

make up nearly one-third of South Vietnam's fighting forces.

The experiment so far has been run almost entirely by four U.S. Army captains and a U.S. Information Service official.

The captains are Jock Modica of Keyport, N.J., who won a Bronze Star recently for an action he fought last December; James MacGill of Fayetteville, N.C.; Philip Werbisky of Chicago and James Drinkwater of Newburyport, Mass.

The Information Service official, 26-year-old Frank W. Scotton, of Needham, Mass., is an old hand at this kind of work. He has lived in Vietnam for 3 years.

The five are among the few Americans in the country who eat and live constantly with the Vietnamese farmer.

Many South Vietnamese officers are suspicious of the project. Some particularly dislike the use of former Vietcong political commissars.

Skilled Vietnamese political instructors have been hard to get, and the Americans have done most of the recruiting.

Project officers insist on honesty in their teaching, and believe the troops should be told about the 1945-54 period when the Communist-led Vietminh fought and defeated the French.

Project teams seek to teach that many Vietnamese patriots joined the Vietminh to fight for independence, but that now South Vietnam is free and the Communists themselves are the "imperialist aggressors."

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, if we had established something like the Freedom Academy in 1960, when the Senate passed our bill, we would today have in Vietnam a more adequate and dependable staff of knowledgeable instructors. The sponsors of the bill do not envision an academy where adoption of terrorist techniques would be recommended; but we assert that since such techniques are utilized against our interests, our people should understand them and know how to cope most effectively with them in nonmilitary techniques and tactics.

Now I turn to recent affairs in Latin America.

Jack Vaughn, Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, recently offered sobering testimony before a subcommittee of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. In testimony appearing on page 91 of the hearings record entitled "Communism in Latin America," Mr. Vaughn said:

I understand that there has been something of a slackening in the rate of Latin Americans going to Cuba for specialized training of all kinds.

I observe that this slackening is probably due to the completion of training and the placement of most cadres in a position to proceed with their exercises in nonmilitary warfare.

Mr. Vaughn continued:

This training today represents the most serious threat to democracy and non-Communist regimes in Latin America.

We know of cases where the individuals of a given country who have been trained in Cuba during the past 5 years, return by the hundreds. And they are still being trained. (Security deletion.)

These people from a cadre of guerrilla units, would-be guerrilla units, and the larger the number, the greater the threat, ultimately, that they will make a move.

But the United States, on the other hand, has offered no political training in defense against nonmilitary aggression, to offset such intensive efforts by pro-

May 14, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

10175

fessional revolutionaries. We have preferred to structure our defense on the efforts of well-intentioned amateurs, both in foreign governments and in our own.

Mr. Vaughn himself is recorded on page 90 as saying:

We are up against full-time Communist professionals when we have part-time, to a large extent, amateurs, combatting communism.

It is like fielding a YMCA football team against the Green Bay Packers.

The columnist Marquis Childs recently afforded his readers insight into this professional revolutionary operation. In his column published in the Washington Post on May 3, 1965, Mr. Childs wrote:

While Nikita Khrushchev was abruptly shoved off the stage into obscurity, the doctrine he proclaimed still prevails. For harassed American policymakers with a second war on their hands that doctrine is a warning sign on the road into a troubled future.

Two conflicts (Vietnam and the Dominican Republic) seem to fall roughly into the formula of "wars of liberation" prescribed by Khrushchev in a speech that has been combed over, studied, analyzed, and interpreted more than any Communist utterance since the end of the war.

The Khrushchev declaration on January 6, 1961, followed a meeting in Moscow of delegates of 81 Communist parties. It was the first authoritative definition of the reasons for the split between Red China and the Soviet Union. Khrushchev declared for "peaceful coexistence," since a nuclear war would destroy all civilization. China was contending for war as an instrument to impose communism, with the risk of a nuclear holocaust accepted.

The landing of the marines in the Dominican Republic is not comparable as yet with the ever-increasing American military effort in Vietnam. But the two conflicts seem to fall roughly into the formula of "wars of liberation" prescribed by Khrushchev in a speech that has been combed over, studied, analyzed and interpreted more than any Communist utterance since the end of the war.

The Khrushchev declaration of January 6, 1961, followed a meeting in Moscow of delegates of 81 Communist parties. It was the first authoritative definition of the reasons for the split between Red China and the Soviet Union. Khrushchev declared for "peaceful coexistence," since a nuclear war would destroy all civilization. China was contending for war as an instrument to impose communism, with the risk of a nuclear holocaust accepted.

The Khrushchev declaration of January 6, 1961, followed a meeting in Moscow of delegates of 81 Communist parties. It was the first authoritative definition of the reasons for the split between Red China and the Soviet Union. Khrushchev declared for "peaceful coexistence," since a nuclear war would destroy all civilization. China was contending for war as an instrument to impose communism, with the risk of a nuclear holocaust accepted.

The Khrushchev declaration of January 6, 1961, followed a meeting in Moscow of delegates of 81 Communist parties. It was the first authoritative definition of the reasons for the split between Red China and the Soviet Union. Khrushchev declared for "peaceful coexistence," since a nuclear war would destroy all civilization. China was contending for war as an instrument to impose communism, with the risk of a nuclear holocaust accepted.

The Khrushchev declaration of January 6, 1961, followed a meeting in Moscow of delegates of 81 Communist parties. It was the first authoritative definition of the reasons for the split between Red China and the Soviet Union. Khrushchev declared for "peaceful coexistence," since a nuclear war would destroy all civilization. China was contending for war as an instrument to impose communism, with the risk of a nuclear holocaust accepted.

The Khrushchev declaration of January 6, 1961, followed a meeting in Moscow of delegates of 81 Communist parties. It was the first authoritative definition of the reasons for the split between Red China and the Soviet Union. Khrushchev declared for "peaceful coexistence," since a nuclear war would destroy all civilization. China was contending for war as an instrument to impose communism, with the risk of a nuclear holocaust accepted.

The Khrushchev declaration of January 6, 1961, followed a meeting in Moscow of delegates of 81 Communist parties. It was the first authoritative definition of the reasons for the split between Red China and the Soviet Union. Khrushchev declared for "peaceful coexistence," since a nuclear war would destroy all civilization. China was contending for war as an instrument to impose communism, with the risk of a nuclear holocaust accepted.

The Khrushchev declaration of January 6, 1961, followed a meeting in Moscow of delegates of 81 Communist parties. It was the first authoritative definition of the reasons for the split between Red China and the Soviet Union. Khrushchev declared for "peaceful coexistence," since a nuclear war would destroy all civilization. China was contending for war as an instrument to impose communism, with the risk of a nuclear holocaust accepted.

The Khrushchev declaration of January 6, 1961, followed a meeting in Moscow of delegates of 81 Communist parties. It was the first authoritative definition of the reasons for the split between Red China and the Soviet Union. Khrushchev declared for "peaceful coexistence," since a nuclear war would destroy all civilization. China was contending for war as an instrument to impose communism, with the risk of a nuclear holocaust accepted.

The Khrushchev declaration of January 6, 1961, followed a meeting in Moscow of delegates of 81 Communist parties. It was the first authoritative definition of the reasons for the split between Red China and the Soviet Union. Khrushchev declared for "peaceful coexistence," since a nuclear war would destroy all civilization. China was contending for war as an instrument to impose communism, with the risk of a nuclear holocaust accepted.

The Khrushchev declaration of January 6, 1961, followed a meeting in Moscow of delegates of 81 Communist parties. It was the first authoritative definition of the reasons for the split between Red China and the Soviet Union. Khrushchev declared for "peaceful coexistence," since a nuclear war would destroy all civilization. China was contending for war as an instrument to impose communism, with the risk of a nuclear holocaust accepted.

in Asia, Latin America, or Africa. Reserves would have to be called back and the draft inevitably expanded. That is the next phase in contingency planning.

According to the Khrushchev doctrine, Communists opposed the "export of revolution." But they also opposed the "imperialist exports of counterrevolution." Kremlinologists interpreted this as a reference to the uprising in Hungary, which was brutally suppressed by Soviet tanks.

The theme of the Khrushchev speech was communism's inevitable triumph by peaceful means if possible and by civil wars of liberation if the imperialists resisted. But in the present confrontation the striking fact is that so far as is known not a single Russian soldier is in combat while 35,000 Americans are already at the shooting stage. That is the painful dilemma for American policymakers.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the press has allowed for closer inspection of the causes of the Dominican crisis.

On May 2, President Johnson advised the world that Communist nonmilitary aggressors had taken control of the Dominican revolt. On May 3, the New York Times recorded these remarks by the President:

The evidence that we have of the revolutionary movement indicates that it took a very tragic turn. Communist leaders, many of them trained in Cuba, seeing a chance to increase disorder, and to gain a foothold, joined the revolution.

They took increasing control. What began as a popular democratic revolution that was committed to democracy and social justice moved into the hands of a band of Communist conspirators.

The American nations cannot, must not, and will not permit the establishment of another Communist government in the Western Hemisphere.

The Washington Post of May 6, 1965, published a list of several of these known trained revolutionaries, identifying some of them by specialty. I ask unanimous consent that the list be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, May 6, 1965]

LIST OF REBELS LINKED TO REDS

Here are the names and backgrounds of 18 Dominican Republic rebels who have had Cuban training as made public by U.S. sources:

1. Luis Felipe Valentino Giro Alcantara. PSPD member, fanatical type who "loves" using Molotov cocktails. Received guerrilla warfare training in Cuba in 1963.

2. Manuel Gonzalez Gonzalez. Spanish Communist who has been in the Dominican Republic since 1940 and is now a PSPD member; probable military leader in current insurrection. Has knowledge of military tactics. Reported Cuban G-2 agent.

3. Miguel Angel Deschamps Erickson. MPD member; received guerrilla warfare training and explosives course in Cuba in 1962. Carried instructions from Cuba to Dominican Republic for MPD in 1963.

4. Lisandro Macarrulla Reyes. PSPD leader; 6-month course in Marxism-Leninism in Cuba.

5. Hector Florentino Olivares. Actively recruiting Communists and leftists for insurrection. Highly skilled and indoctrinated for this role. Visitor to Soviet bloc and China and ardent admirer of Mao Tse-tung.

6. Juan Miguel Roman Diaz. High-level member of APCJ. Was key man in guerrilla activities in Dominican Republic in late 1963;

Mr. Childs' article was published May 3. Today, the dilemma is greater, since we now have about 65,000 Americans at the shooting stage.

I ask unanimous consent that the article written by Marquis Childs, entitled "New Red Tactics Creating Dilemma," and published in the Washington Post of May 3, 1965, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, May 3, 1965]

NEW RED TACTICS CREATING DILEMMA

(By Marquis Childs)

While Nikita Khrushchev was abruptly shoved off the stage into obscurity, the doc-

10176

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

May 14, 1965

subsequently deported and went to Cuba in June 1964; appeared in Algeria, November 1964 on APCJ mission.

7. Manuel Escobar Alfonseca. PSPD member; spent considerable time in Prague in 1963.

8. Jose Rodriguez Acosta. High-level PSPD member; reportedly received guerrilla warfare training in Cuba in 1962; has also been in Czechoslovakia and the Soviet Union.

9. Fidelio Despradel Roques. APCJ leader; received guerrilla training in Cuba in 1963. Presently involved in one of the rebel garrisons.

10. Cayetano Rodriguez del Prado. MPD leader; hard-core Communist revolutionary; received training in Cuba; has trained in Soviet bloc and China. Involved in Cuban intelligence service operation in 1963 to infiltrate himself, two others, arms and equipment into the country.

11. Nicolas Quirico Valdez Conde. High-level PSPD member; has lived in Moscow and speaks Russian fluently; was Russian interpreter for Fidel Castro in Cuba.

12. Ramond Agustin Pinedo Mejia. MPD leader, was involved in 1963 guerrilla movement.

13. Jaime Capell Bello. APCJ leader; also involved with MPD. Traveled in Cuba, Soviet Union, and Czechoslovakia from August 1961 to April 1962.

14. Josefina (Piqui) Lora Iglesias. Female with medical training. APCJ leader; was involved in APCJ guerrilla movement, 1963, had political indoctrination course in Cuba late 1964.

15. Rafael de la Altagracia (Baby) Mejia Lluberes. APCJ leader, long-time Communist revolutionary, was involved in 1963 attempt to overthrow President Romulo Betancourt of Venezuela; had guerrilla training and political indoctrination course in Cuba 1963.

16. Norge Williams Botello Fernandez. APCJ militant activist, had intensive military training in Cuba 1963-64.

17. Hector Homero Hernandez Vargas. APCJ leader, took part in student riots 1961, had training in Cuba 1964, visited China same year.

18. Luis Bernardo Genao. APCJ leader, involved in 1963 guerrilla activities, was in Cuba 1962.

Here are the names of 40 Dominican Republic rebels known as leftist activists, as made public by U.S. sources:

1. Carlos Dore C. PSPD member; official of pro-Communist student federation. Preparing Molotov cocktails.

2. Fidelio Despradel Roques. APCJ leader; received guerrilla training in Cuba in 1963. Presently involved in one of the rebel garrisons.

3. Asdrubal Dominguez Guerrero. PSPD leader and a student leader armed for action.

4. Emma Tavarez Justo. APCJ leader, agitating for Dominicans to join in the insurrection.

5. Pedro Julio Evangelista. Pro-PSPD labor leader, exhorting workers to support rebel government.

6. Manuel Escobar Alfonseca. PSPD member; in charge of PSPD garrison in downtown Santo Domingo.

7. Edmundo "Mundo" Garcia Castillo. PSPD member, distributing PSPD fliersheets.

8. Porfirio "Naboche" Garcia. PSPD member making Molotov cocktails.

9. Facundo Gomez. PSPD member and former member of PRD. Part owner of boat which landed arms, ammunition, and three top MPD leaders in Dominican Republic from Cuba in late 1963, during guerrilla activities.

10. Eduardo "Piti" Houellement. PSPD member or sympathizer fighting in streets with arms.

11. Antonio Isa Conde. PSPD member distributing PSPD fliersheets calling on people to fight.

12. Narciso Isa Conde. PSPD member or sympathizer fighting in the streets with firearms.

13. Alejandro Lajara. APCJ member, named deputy chief of intelligence under his father. Record of arson back to Balaguer tenure.

14. Juan Ducoudray Mansfield. A long-time leader of the Dominican Communist Party who has extensive contact with foreign Communists. Now in hiding, he has been involved in the direction of the current insurrection.

15. Felix Servio Ducoudray Mansfield Jr. Probably a leader of the Dominican Communist Party. Has lived in the Soviet Union and in Cuba, and has received indoctrination. Has made numerous trips between the Dominican Republic and Cuba. He is the *Prensa Latina* representative in the Dominican Republic.

16. Buenaventura Johnson Pimentel. PSPD member with machineguns.

17. Marcos de Vargas. Pro-Communist labor leader, exhorting workers to support rebels.

18. Aristeo Soso Valerio. PSPD member preparing Molotov cocktails.

19. Ubaldo Roa del Rosario. PSPD sympathizer; armed for action.

20. Luis Reyes. Pro-Castro student leader.

21. Ramon Augusto Pinedo Mejia. MPD leader, ordering MPD to demonstrate.

22. Milvio Perez Perez. PSPD leader distributing arms.

23. Ignacio Perez Mencia. PSPD member preparing Molotov cocktails.

24. Daniel Ozuna Hernandez. APCJ leader, urging people toward rebellion.

25. Manuel Ortiz Desangles. PSPD member, preparing Molotov cocktails.

26. Luis Montas Gonzalez. APCJ leader and FED representative to PSPD Central Committee. Carrying firearms.

27. Diomedes Mercedes Batista. PSPD member; armed.

28. Arsenio Ortiz de Ferran. French-born Dominican, uses Cuban passport, in 1962 was in contact with Cuban ambassador at Paris.

29. Silvano Lora Vicente. PSPD member, "Intellectual Fidelista," had training Cuba 1963-64, in 1964 traveled to Algeria and Moscow.

30. Franklin Franco Pichardo. PSPD member, trained in Soviet Union, also made another recent trip to Moscow and Prague.

31. Antonio Isa Conde. PSPD member, had training in Cuba 1963, went from there to U.S.S.R., was in Prague at time of APCJ guerrilla movement in 1963.

32. Ramon Andres Avelino Garcia. Was in Cuba 1963.

33. Delta Bohemia Soto Grullon. PSPD member, wife of Rafael Vilalona who is now in Soviet Union.

34. Eduardo Houellement Roques. Was in Cuba 1963, activities as Fidelista student agitator since 1961.

35. Dato Pagan Perdomo. Thoroughly schooled Communist intellectual, was in Cuba-launched invasion of Dominican Republic 1959.

36. Wilson del Orde. PSPD member, trained in Cuba 1963.

37. Abelarde Vicioso Gonzalez. PSPD member, who has lived in Cuba, has been in Moscow and Prague and had indoctrinations both places.

38. Pedro Julio Mir Valention. Important PSPD member, reputedly close personal friend of Fidel Castro. Communist activities, including travel to Communist countries, go back to 1947; had broadcast to Dominican Republic on Radio Havana.

39. Juan Jose Matos Rivera. APCJ youth secretary, has been in Cuba, returned to country clandestinely in early 1965. Is possible Cuban intelligence agent.

40. Tomas Farmino Erickson Alvarez. Long-time Communist, high-level MPD mem-

ber, ardently anti-United States, had training in Cuba early 1960's.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the professional preparation of many others—not of their number, but apparently supporting those listed—had been dealt with 3 days earlier in a Seymour Freidin dispatch from London, published in the New York Herald Tribune:

A group of about 20 Dominicans mainly in their late twenties left Czechoslovakia last week with Santo Domingo as their planned port of arrival.

If conditions are stabilized, namely, if the revolt is crushed—the Dominicans are supposed to go underground and await further instructions.

Carrying a variety of papers and passports—Dominican, Cuban, and Haitian, as well as from East European nations—last week's travelers had virtually all, as far as could be learned, been housed and subsidized in Czechoslovakia for the last 2 years.

Some have been known to talk of their experience in Cuba. At least two of them boasted of seeing a little revolutionary action in Zanzibar with a group of Cubans at the time of the early 1964 revolt on the island.

It is difficult to assess the number of Dominicans in Eastern Europe. A sizable group, claiming Dominican citizenship also is resident in the Soviet Union as students.

Others have been encountered in Poland and a handful in Bulgaria.

Latin American "revolutionary" students have been given more specialized treatment than most others from abroad. Outside the usual courses in ideology, they have gone through paramilitary training. The most militant also went through the trickier routine in sabotage and in training sabotage units under highly primitive conditions.

The vanguard that started toward Santo Domingo last week also was well heeled. They carried wads of Yankee dollars supplied by their faculty advisers.

I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "En Route From Prague—Red-Trained Dominicans," written by Seymour Freidin, and published in the New York Herald Tribune of May 3, 1965, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune, May 3, 1965]

EN ROUTE FROM PRAGUE—RED-TRAINED DOMINICANS

(By Seymour Freidin)

LONDON.—A group of about 20 Dominicans mainly in their late twenties, left Czechoslovakia last week with Santo Domingo as their planned port of arrival.

They are distinct from the 53 Communists specifically singled out Friday by the White House for their training abroad and subsequent role in the Dominican Republic upheaval.

If conditions are stabilized, namely, if the revolt is crushed—the Dominicans are supposed to go underground in the Caribbean and await further instructions. Reports on their moves and objections have come from an assortment of sources, some of whom are still in the Latin-American section of Charles University in Prague.

Carrying a variety of papers and passports—Dominican, Cuban, and Haitian as well as from East European nations—last week's travelers set out on several airlines for Santo Domingo. They had virtually all, as far as could be learned, been housed and subsidized in Czechoslovakia for the last 2 years.

May 14, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

Ancient Charles University, a mighty citadel of European learning until a Communist regime took the nation over, today has special faculties for Latin American, African, Asian, and Arab students. They are regarded as revolutionaries until proved otherwise, as when African students were manhandled and battled their persecutors on the campus and the main streets.

None of the Latin Americans has been known to get into any wrangle with authority. They are predominantly from Cuba, but are usually assigned with other Latins to the same classes. Some of those who left last week have been known to talk of their experience in Cuba. At least two of them boasted of seeing a little revolutionary action in Zanzibar with a group of Cubans at the time of the early 1964 revolt on the island.

Some educated guessing is in progress on where the new spearhead from Prague may go underground. Port-au-Prince, capital of Haiti where Dr. Francois (Papa Doc) Duvalier is considered a political pariah by the United States as a savage dictator, may well be a haven. One part of the island of Hispaniola is occupied by Haiti; the other by the Dominican Republic.

It is difficult to assess the number of Dominicans in Eastern Europe. A sizable group, claiming Dominican citizenship, also is resident in the Soviet Union as students. There, they have generally been integrated with Cubans brought in for military, technological and agricultural training.

There also have been Dominicans, who settled quietly for a while in Spain. Then, they slipped away to Central Europe, winding up in Prague. Others have been encountered in Poland and a handful in Bulgaria.

Since most men—only a very few women are known in these Dominican groups—carry Cuban papers in Eastern Europe, it is on their own say-so that their Dominican origin is accepted. Marriage between these exiled Latins and East European women is supposedly rare.

Latin American "revolutionary" students have been given more specialized treatment than most others from abroad. Outside the usual courses in ideology, they have gone through paramilitary training. The most militant also went through the trickier routine in sabotage and in training sabotage units under highly primitive conditions.

These experiences are known and have been discussed by the trainees, themselves, with other comrades at school after they vanished and reappeared a couple of months later in class. The vanguard that started toward Santo Domingo last week also was well heeled. They carried wads of Yankee dollars supplied by their faculty advisers.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, on May 1, there had already been published in the Washington Post an analysis of the Dominican crisis, interpreted as a Communist coup. It appeared a day before the President's statement, to which I have referred. This article, written by Al Burt of the Chicago Daily News Service, contained a now-familiar statement:

The Dominican Republic rebellion developed in a classic Communist pattern.

Strikingly similar words were filed earlier this year from Brazzaville, the Congo Republic: "a classic Communist-style takeover." For this, I refer Senators to page 4572 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. From Khartoum, Sudan, came the statement: "A textbook case of an attempted Communist takeover." In this connection, I refer to page 7602 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

These methods are identifiable and fully subject to interpretation, comprehension, and effective resistance—if only we have the will to do it.

Mr. Burt continued:

Communists played on the emotions of a troubled nation during an election year. Under the guise of advocating constitutional government, they talked legitimate political elements into a united popular front.

This precipitated chaos, during which no side had control. In this disorder, known Communists played leadership roles in fomenting anarchy and influencing street mobs.

Exiled members of the three Communist or pro-Communist parties kicked out of the country more than a year ago had been returning recently. There were indications that some had received training in subversion in Communist countries—unconfirmed reports said Cuba and Czechoslovakia.

The exiles had slipped in while the attention of the government was devoted to internal problems.

In traditional style the Communists passed out weapons indiscriminately. This led to armed street mobs, shooting and confusion, upon which they could further capitalize.

There were reports of firing squad executions and shouts of "Paredon" (to the wall).

No one accuses Bosch of being Communist, but Communists created the chaos. Only they were organized for that and only they are benefiting.

I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "Dominican Crisis Seen as Red Plan," written by Al Burt, and published in the Washington Post of May 1, 1965, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, May 1, 1965]

DOMINICAN CRISIS SEEN AS RED PLAN

(By Al Burt)

MIAMI, April 30.—The Dominican Republic rebellion developed in a classic Communist pattern.

Here is what apparently happened:

Communists played on the emotions of a troubled nation during an election year. Under the guise of advocating constitutional government, they talked legitimate political elements into a united popular front.

This precipitated chaos, during which no side had control. In this disorder, known Communists played leadership roles in fomenting anarchy and influencing street mobs.

Dominican sources so far have identified these men:

Manuel Gonzalez, central committee member of the Popular Socialist Party (PSP); Carlos Dore, PSP member and an officer in the Dominican Student Federation; Manuel Escobar Alfonsena, PSP member; Hector Florentino Olivares, member of the Fragua, Communist student organization; Lusi Montas Gonzalez, June 14 Party; Daniel Ozuma, June 14 Party.

TWO RED PARTIES

There are two Communist Parties in the Dominican Republic, both illegal.

The PSP is considered the best disciplined, oriented toward Moscow. The other, the Dominican Popular Movement (MPD), is Chinese-oriented.

The June 14 Party originated in 1959 as a nationalist movement. It fell into the hands of Communist leadership and now is illegal and an open advocate of Fidel Castro.

The background of the situation is this:

Juan Bosch's party, the Dominican Revolutionary Party (PRD), had been out of power

for some 19 months. There were no public demonstrations in his behalf at the time of his ouster from the Presidency in September 1963.

The PRD had rejected the idea of September elections and said Bosch should be reinstated as President without them.

The PSP, MPD, and June 14 Party also adopted that approach but added that the movement should be a united popular front to oppose the "government of force." This is considered a traditional tactic.

EXILES RETURN

Exiled members of the three parties kicked out of the country more than a year ago had been returning recently. There were indications that some had received training in subversion in Communist countries—unconfirmed reports said Cuba and Czechoslovakia.

The exiles had slipped in while the attention of the Government was devoted to internal problems. Some simply walked in off a plane at the airport. Some landed from small boats along the country's 1,000-mile coastline.

The PRD, apparently believing it could control the situation, was swept into the popular front.

Directing the operations of the PRD in Santo Domingo was Angel Mielan, who had shared the leadership of the party with Bosch when he won the Presidency. Later, after the 1963 coup, Bosch and Mielan split. Mielan was arrested in Puerto Rico with Communist literature in his baggage.

The PRD approached some of the younger military officers and the keyman proved to be Col. Francisco Caamano Deno. When the revolt came, the colonel carried some of the military units with him.

The popular front put demonstrators into the street, and these more than once saved the rebellion from defeat.

STREET MOBS FORM

In traditional style the Communists passed out weapons indiscriminately. This led to armed street mobs, shooting, and confusion, upon which they could further capitalize.

Some of those with weapons were children from 12 to 16. Homes were looted and one bank was reported broken into. Embassy sanctuary was violated. There were reports of firing squad executions, and shouts of "paredon" (to the wall).

In this atmosphere, because the PSP was the better disciplined and trained, it gradually assumed a dominant role although the PRD apparently did still command the loyalty of Colonel Caamano.

Observers doubt that a true grassroots movement to restore Bosch to the Presidency would have waited 19 months after his ouster to express itself.

No one accuses Bosch of being Communist, but Communists created the chaos. Only they were organized for that and only they are benefiting.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I wish to refer to one other article. The author is Tad Szluc, and the article was published in the New York Times. In the article, he reported from Santo Domingo, as follows:

Many Americans here, both official and private, believe that while the United States has displayed impressive efficiency in establishing its Military Establishment in the Dominican Republic, it does not match it with equivalent political action.

Improving our capability for effective political action, Mr. President, is precisely what the sponsors of the freedom academy bill propose. We advocate correction of a critical deficiency in our current defense posture.

10178

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

May 14, 1965

I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "U.S. Troops Split Dominican Rebels," written by Tad Szulc, and published in the New York Times of May 4, 1965, be printed in the RECORD, along with four editorials. They are entitled "Freedom Academy Called Vital," from the Madison, Ind., Courier of January 18, 1965; "The Red Hand in Riots," from the Billings, Mont., Gazette of January 4, 1965; "Freedom Academy Need Is Urgent," from the Jefferson City, Mo., Post Tribune of January 4, 1965; and "Critical African Situation Calls for Review of American Aid, Idea, Policies," from the Huron, S. Dak., Daily Plainsmen of May 2, 1965.

There being no objection, the article and the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, May 4, 1965]

U.S. TROOPS SPLIT DOMINICAN REBELS: GI'S CUT CAPITAL IN TWO—ANOTHER MARINE KILLED—LONG OCCUPATION SEEN

(By Tad Szulc)

SANTO DOMINGO, DOMINICAN REPUBLIC, May 3.—U.S. forces opened a corridor today through rebel-held territory in this capital, cutting the city in two.

This move came as United States, in effect, acknowledged that it expected to maintain troops in the Dominican Republic for an indefinite time, at least until Dominicans find a democratic solution for the civil war, which has raged for the last 10 days.

While advancing early today, the paratroopers had several engagements with the rebels, killing two of them, according to reports.

Another marine was killed at dawn by a rebel sniper at the northeast corner of the expanded international zone perimeter. He was shot through the head.

TASK MAY TAKE MONTHS

This brought to three the number of marines killed since U.S. troops moved into Santo Domingo last Thursday. A paratrooper died at the San Isidro base this afternoon when a grenade exploded in his hands accidentally.

The decision to control the small Caribbean country militarily until a viable government can be established—a task that under the present conditions may take many months—results from the conclusion reached by the Johnson administration in the last 48 hours that the rebel movement has fallen under the domination of Communist forces.

This, however, is a controversial point. The rebels deny it and some competent Americans privately take exception to so sweeping a view of the situation.

The United States thinking, according to these sources, does not exclude the possibility of asking the Organization of American States to establish a form of temporary trusteeship over the Dominican Republic.

An OAS factfinding mission and José A. Mora, Secretary General of the Organization, are now in Santo Domingo. They are expected to report later in the week to the ministerial meeting of the Inter-American Organization convened in Washington.

The OAS group met today with the rebel command, and yesterday some of its members flew to cities in the provinces to check on the situation.

The corridor across Santo Domingo, opening direct communications between the international zone in the west and the San Isidro Air Force Base on the east bank of the Ozama River, was secured just after midnight when paratroopers of the 82d Airborne Division broke through the perimeter around the Duarte Bridge over the Ozama River.

They then linked up with the marines, who advanced three blocks east from the international area, which is under their control.

TROOPS ADVANCE 3 MILES

The paratroopers advanced nearly 3 miles across most of the rebel territory to achieve the linkup and to open the corridor that runs along a west-east line.

The one-street-wide corridor cuts Santo Domingo into southern and northern sections.

The marines reported no fighting in their advance, but late this morning the paratroopers came under fire near the point of their junction with the marines.

This dawn attack, near the U.S. Embassy, was one of the three against the main American compound. There were no other significant military actions in the last 24 hours except for skirmishes in the corridor and sniper fire at various points.

The command of the American forces is situated next to the Embassy in a house once owned by the former dictator Rafael Leonidas Trujillo Molina. The house serves as headquarters for Lt. Gen. Bruce Palmer, who commands the ground forces of Joint Task Force 122, made up of about 14,000 paratroopers and marines.

The U.S. military buildup continued despite a tenuous truce negotiated last Friday by the Papal Nuncio and notwithstanding the new talks conducted by the OAS and American diplomats.

The apparent intent of the United States to keep its troops in the Dominican Republic for an extended time was emphasized by an American spokesman, who said one of the missions of the American troops was to "help Dominicans to find a democratic solution of their problems."

LEAFLETS EXPLAIN AIM

Leaflets dropped on Santo Domingo by U.S. aircraft and helicopters also stressed that one of the American missions was to secure such a "democratic solution."

But just how the United States proposed to go about helping the Dominicans find such a solution no one seemed to know.

John Bartlow Martin, former Ambassador to the Dominican Republic, reported to President Johnson last night that the rebel movement had fallen under the control of "Castro communism."

Mr. Martin, sent here last Saturday as the President's personal envoy, is known to have concluded after talks—including a long conference Saturday afternoon with the rebel command—that nothing further could be salvaged from the movement, which was initially designed to bring back former President Juan Bosch to power.

Mr. Bosch was overthrown by a military coup in September 1963, and the insurrection to bring him back to office was led by a group of army officers and leaders of the Dominican Revolutionist Party, headed by the former President.

However, the movement got out of hand early last week and extreme leftist factions tried to dominate it.

Mr. Martin's judgment is that the pro-Bosch democratic elements have been destroyed in the civil war, which may have cost as many as 2,000 lives, and that Communists are in control of the situation.

However, this conclusion is not shared by all observers here. Some feel that it would be an error for the United States to convince itself that Communists have the upper hand and that consequently no further political efforts should be made.

Many Americans here, both official and private, believe that while the United States has displayed impressive efficiency in establishing its military establishment in the Dominican Republic, it does not match it with equivalent political action.

Until Mr. Martin's arrival, no representative of the U.S. Government had established

permanent contact with the rebel command. The contacts with the rebels were broken last Tuesday when it appeared that the pro-Bosch movement had failed.

It is impossible to tell whether, at this late stage, Mr. Bosch is still in a position to help salvage the democratic features of the revolution launched in his name. Many Americans believe it should at least be tried, especially in the light of his wide popularity.

It was reported that Mr. Martin, a friend of Mr. Bosch, might fly to San Juan to confer with the former President, provided the meeting was authorized by President Johnson.

At the rebel headquarters in the Plaza Independencia area, rebel spokesmen steadfastly denied that they were part of the Communist movement.

Col. Francisco Caamano Deno, military head of the rebellion, said in a telephone interview, "We do not have a Communist problem."

He said the rebellion was still intended to bring back Mr. Bosch, but it was not clear that the Communist elements in the rebel leadership necessarily shared that view.

A number of Mr. Bosch's party members continued to hold important positions in the rebel command, and they, too, insisted that "our movement is not Communist."

"It is 1 minute to midnight, and if we do not act at once in the political field the movement will really become Communist and we shall have to maintain a permanent military occupation in this country," an American official said.

[From the Madison (Ind.) Courier, Jan. 18, 1965]

FREEDOM ACADEMY CALLED VITAL

From time to time congressmen and private citizens have called for creation of a freedom academy. This academy would teach Americans and foreigners to fight communism, by revealing Communist techniques and by reinforcing democratic ideals and organization.

A freedom academy seems more urgently needed than ever, according to facts revealed in a January Reader's Digest article, "How the Reds Make a Riot." Written by Eugene Methvin of the magazine's Washington staff and based on 4 years of research, the article discloses that so-called "spontaneous demonstrations" in many parts of the world are in fact carefully staged by Communists and their dupes.

These riots have become a deadly weapon in the cold war, says Methvin. He cites instances of organized violence, "bloody street fights between Buddhists and Catholics in Vietnam, food marches in India, chaos in the Congo, and mass executions by a riot-installed Red regime in Zanzibar."

There are a number of techniques used in staging such violent demonstrations. Included are infiltration, where a few militant Reds invade an organization and turn it to their own nefarious uses; mixing of such respectable terms as "peace" and "freedom" with class warfare terminology such as "imperialism" and "exploitation"; and the hiring of mobs to set off demonstrations. One example of this latter technique was shown in Brazil, when pro-Red demonstrators questioned at random admitted they knew nothing about the issues involved in the demonstration; they had been paid to come out, they said.

Most despicable of the Communist techniques is that of creating a martyr, since it often involves murdering an innocent person. For example, when Vice President Nixon was attacked by a mob in Caracas, U.S. Secret Service men saw small children being shoved in front of his car. The Red hope was to create a martyr and thereby increase the agitation.

Methvin suggests several ways to deal with these Communist schemes. But what stands

May 14, 1965

Approved For Release 2005/07/13 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000600080005-3
CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

10179

out most clearly is the need to understand Red methods. Many of the tragic events mentioned in the article might have been avoided or minimized with greater understanding of how the Communists were operating.

[From the Billings (Mont.) Gazette, Jan. 4, 1965]

THE RED HAND IN RIOTS

Often suspected but not always proved is the Communist influence in riots and demonstrations in this country and elsewhere. But enough evidence to alert all non-Communist nations has accumulated in recent years, and a member of the Readers Digest Washington staff, Eugene H. Methvin, has wrapped it up in an enlightening report of how this weapon of the cold war works.

The methods include infiltration of an organization to turn it to nefarious uses, capitalizing on prejudice against such terms as "imperialism" and "exploitation," creating a martyr which often involves murdering an innocent person, and maneuvering into positions to exhort crowds into action against a government.

Methvin advocates establishment of a freedom academy to teach both Americans and foreigners how to fight communism. This would make a valuable addition to other preparedness efforts initiated in recent years. These include the International Police Academy in Washington to train foreign police in on the spot handling of Red insurgency, and the American Institute of Free Labor Development founded by business and labor leaders and with U.S. Government support is training thousands of Latin American trade unionists in democratic organization and anti-Communist action.

[From the Jefferson City (Mo.) Post Tribune, Jan. 4, 1965]

FREEDOM ACADEMY NEED IS URGENT

One of the most essential pieces of legislation the 1965 Congress could enact would be the creation of a freedom academy.

Such an academy would be aimed at teaching Americans, including high U.S. officials and Congressmen, and foreigners to fight communism, by revealing Communist techniques and reinforcing our freedoms and organization needed to achieve these ends.

An article in the January Reader's Digest advances another reason why the creation of a freedom academy is an urgent order of business for the new Congress and President Johnson. Written by Eugene Methvin of the magazine's Washington staff, the article entitled "How the Reds Make a Riot" is based on 4 years of research. It discloses that many so-called spontaneous demonstrations in many parts of the world, including the United States are in fact carefully staged by Communists and their dupes.

These riots have become a deadly weapon in the cold war, says Mr. Methvin. He cites an instances of organized violence, bloody street fights between Buddhists and Catholics in Vietnam, food marches in India, chaos in the Congo, and mass executions by a riot-installed Red regime in Zanzibar.

As he notes there are a number of techniques used in staging such violent demonstrations. Included are infiltration, where a few militant Reds invade an organization and turn it to their own nefarious uses, mixing of such respectable terms as "peace" and "freedom" with class-warfare terminology such as "imperialism" and "exploitation," and the hiring of mobs to set off demonstrations.

One example of the latter technique was shown in Brazil, where pro-Red demonstrators questioned at random admitted they knew nothing about the issues involved in the demonstration. They frankly said they had been paid to participate.

Most despicable of the Communist techniques is that of creating a martyr, Mr. Methvin

says, since it often involves murder in an innocent person. For example, when Vice President Nixon was attacked by a mob in Caracas, U.S. Secret Service men saw small children being shoved in front of his car. The Red hope, Mr. Methvin adds, was to create a martyr and thereby increase the agitation.

The author suggests several ways to deal with these Communist schemes. But what stands out most clearly is the need to understand Red methods. Many of the tragic events mentioned in the article might have been avoided or minimized with greater understanding of how the Communists were operating.

A freedom academy, of course, would be highly beneficial in exposing other Communist techniques, tricks and treachery.

Congressmen and private citizens, as Mr. Methvin notes in his articles, have from time to time called for the creation of a Freedom Academy. The concept was originated back in 1950 by the Orlando, Fla., committee, a patriotic group.

A Senate bill, which calls for the establishment of a Freedom Academy, has bipartisan support, including Democratic Senators DODD, LAUSCHE, PROXIMIRE, and SMATHERS and Republican Senators HICKENLOOPER and MUNDT. Barry Goldwater also was a strong supporter of the bill.

There is also a House bill, which is a slight variation of the Senate proposal. Under it, a Freedom Commission would consist of six members and a chairman to be appointed by the President.

Missouri's Eighth District Congressman RICHARD ICHORD earlier this year urged the Missouri Junior Chamber of Commerce to support the House bill, pending in the House Un-American Activities Committee of which Mr. ICHORD is a member.

In his appeal, Mr. ICHORD declared: " * * * We have waited too long already. Every day opportunities are slipping away, some to be lost forever." There remains, he warned the Jaycees and other Americans "in the world an evil, well organized, hard-hitting, determined and unrelenting force which in its own words is out to bury you as an American and your way of life. This is a fact of life. All the wishful thinking in the world will not make it go away * * *."

Senator DODD's warning delivered earlier in 1964 carried the same urgency: "If we wait very many more Panamas and Zanzibars (his address came shortly after Red activities in these two countries) before we wake up to the realization that such (the present) a training program is not adequate, it may prove too late to save what is left of the free world."

The Freedom Academy, under both bills, would be an institution where Americans and citizens of other free countries would receive concentrated training in Communist techniques and operations. In addition, they would receive training in tactics and methods designed to frustrate the Reds at every operational level, from elections for the control of trade unions and student organizations, street riots, to attempted insurrections.

And, as Senator DODD suggests, it is not enough to teach our Foreign Service personnel the history and language of the country to which they will be assigned. It is not enough to teach them the details of protocol and etiquette of diplomacy. Nor is it enough to give them academic instruction on Communist philosophy and history.

The foggy bottom State Department reportedly is opposed to creation of a Freedom Academy.

Mr. Methvin's article in the Reader's Digest is a most timely one.

It deserves the strong and persistent support of all thinking Americans, who would do well to write their Congressmen and Senators voicing such backing. If and when

such a Freedom Academy is created (1965 must be the year), there will be ample opportunity to demand that the Freedom Commission and Academy are headed and staffed by vigorous anti-Communists.

[From the Huron (S. Dak.) Daily Plainsman, May 2, 1965]

CRITICAL AFRICAN SITUATION CALLS FOR REVIEW OF AMERICAN AID, IDEA POLICIES

There is a very real danger that communism will emerge as the dominant political philosophy in Africa.

Africa, considered a rich prize in the ideological battle for leadership between Russia and Red China, is being subjected to a concentrated effort by both countries as each seeks to sell its own brand of communism to the people of the emerging nations of the once-dark continent.

This battle between the two giants of communism, subjects the African people to great doses of economic aid, training programs, red-carpet tours, and anticolonialism propaganda barrages. So far, it looks like Red China is ahead, even though Russia is spending more money in the race between the two Red nations.

But African leaders, not wanting to go down with the loser, accept the aids without offering any political allegiance in return. Because of this nonalliance, the United States and other nations of the free world have a golden opportunity to capitalize on the intra-Communist rift and guide the new nations along the path toward freedom and democracy as their new governments become more stable.

The United States is in the battle in Africa. Peace Corpsmen are working in the villages and towns, American aid is offered the new nations, and our own Voice of America blares in rebuttal to the powerful voice of Red China.

But this is not enough, declares Senator KARL MUNDT, of South Dakota. He again proposes a Freedom Academy for training of oversea nationals and Government and private industry personnel to work with citizens of other countries in our "friendship corps." This would be a logical expansion of our present efforts, the Senator says, citing the African situation as an illustration of the present world conditions.

A Freedom Academy, which Senator MUNDT has been urging for a number of years, could be part of an expanded American effort, and his proposal should be considered in a reexamination of our aid and influence programs. The critical African situation illustrates the need for a continual study of the American effort and the need to adapt foreign-aid programs and policies to changing conditions in the ideological effort which is the quiet, at times unnoticed, war.

RESTORATION OF OUR MERCHANT MARINE

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, the decline of America's merchant marine is becoming more grave, each year.

At the end of World War II, the United States had by far the greatest merchant fleet in the world. Today, it ranks only fifth, or perhaps sixth; and it seems certain that this downward trend will continue, unless some immediate action is taken.

In recent years, the Soviet Union has been making significant strides in building up her merchant fleet, and will soon match or exceed our world rank. The Soviets have also been increasing the percentage of their trade carried on Soviet ships. Presently, 42 percent of the

May 14, 1965

10180

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

Soviet Union's waterborne trade is carried by her own ships.

It concerns me to note that more than 91 percent of America's maritime trade is handled by foreign-flag vessels.

It further concerns me to note that the "flag of convenience" countries of Liberia, Panama, and Honduras list more U.S.-owned ship tonnage than does the United States itself.

In the event of war the implications of a weak merchant marine could be calamitous.

In addition to the threat from the Soviet Union, a weak merchant marine in peacetime permits many millions of dollars, in the form of taxes and wages, to drain out of our economy. Considering our current international-payments problem, this factor deserves greater attention than it has heretofore received.

In this connection, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, following my statement, a reprint of an article entitled "Merchant Marine: To Control the High Seas?" which was published in the March 1965 issue of Soviet Life. This reprint includes the comments of Joseph Curran, president of the National Maritime Union of America, AFL-CIO.

I particularly wish to bring to the attention of Senators, Mr. Curran's concluding remarks, as follows:

We are a nation with some 11,000 miles of seacoast, on every side of us. We are the greatest producer of goods in the world, with our production increasingly dependent on raw materials brought in from overseas. We are the leader of the free world in a period of grave international tensions which show no sign of easing.

Yet ours is no better than fifth, and probably sixth, among the merchant marines of the world. We have fewer ships in action today than we had in 1939, despite the tremendous increase in our foreign commerce and our international responsibilities since that time.

It is not fear of the Soviets that should impel us to restore our American-flag merchant marine. We should do so out of a sense of positive national purpose, decent self-interest and national pride. And we had better do it fast.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MERCHANT MARINE: TO CONTROL THE HIGH SEAS?

FLYING THE HIGH SEAS

(The growth of the Soviet merchant marine in recent years has stirred interest and speculation in the foreign press. Our correspondent Yuri Andreyev asked Victor Bakayev, U.S.S.R. Minister of the Merchant Marine, to give our readers a picture of the trends and developments in Soviet shipping. He provided us with facts and figures, and invited Deputy Minister Dmitri Zотов, Department Chiefs Nikolai Bykov and Nikolai Malakhov, and the head of V/O Sovfrakht, Alexander Saveliev, to discuss their specific divisions.)

(Victor Bakayev, U.S.S.R. Minister of the Merchant Marine)

Question. The Western press has said on several occasions lately that our merchant marine is being expanded in order to control the high seas. Will you please comment on the statement?

Answer. It is true that the Western press has been paying a good deal of attention to

our merchant marine recently. There has been much talk in the press and in speeches about our expansion, about our attempts to "invade" the world shipping market, about our "crafty objectives."

Edwin M. Hood, president of the Ship-builders Council of America, voiced the opinion that as a result of the extensive Soviet shipbuilding program, we may exert an unusual, surprising, and very significant effect on shipping and traditional patterns of transportation. The conclusion is correct and shows foresight, and we cannot help agreeing with Mr. Hood. We can also understand his regret that the rate of growth of the Soviet merchant marine is faster than that of the United States. But we are surprised, to say the least, when he goes on to say that the expansion of our shipping is aimed at control of the high seas.

We are inclined to think that perhaps some of the people who follow the progress of our merchant marine from abroad have a private ax to grind. They are inclined to regard us as a rival. To be sure, for some decades now the Soviet Union has chartered hundreds of vessels to transport its goods, for which it has paid out hundreds of thousands of dollars. Some people have begun to think of this as a kind of Christmas present that is due them. And as soon as the Soviet Union began to build up its own fleet for transporting its own goods, the accusations of expansion became loud and numerous.

If we turn to the most accurate and objective language of facts and figures, then it becomes obvious that there are no grounds for such accusations. In the past 10 years the turnover of Soviet foreign trade increased 2.7 times, while the tonnage of the Soviet merchant marine increased by two and a half times. The Soviet Union has moved to fifth place in the world for trade turnover, and it is only reasonable that we should be taking steps to build up our merchant marine to keep pace with world shipping.

Simply, we are expanding our fleet to freight our goods because we wish to develop our trade in every way possible.

Question. How much of the country's trade is handled by the merchant marine?

Answer. The Soviet Union has trade relations with 91 countries, 13 of them Socialist, 51 developing, and 27 capitalist. Our ships call at the ports of these or neighboring countries to deliver goods. In 1964 they sailed a total of 44 million nautical miles or, figuratively speaking, they spanned the earth 2,000 times along the equator, weighing anchor 11,000 times at 600 ports of call. Ships flying the Soviet flag sail all the seas and oceans of the world from the Arctic Ocean to the Antarctic.

First of all, I would like to say a few words about our shipping with the Socialist countries. Their rapid economic growth and socialist division of labor have resulted in an increased exchange of commodities among these countries and consequently in the rapid development of shipping. At present approximately a third of the overall turnover of exports and imports carried by Soviet shipping goes to and from the countries of the Socialist community.

A good deal of merchandise is shipped to the developing countries, including foreign trade goods and consignments of economic aid. The U.S.S.R. is helping the newly independent states to build about 500 industrial and other projects. More than 700,000 tons of various goods were delivered from Soviet ports by sea to Bhilai (India) alone for the largest iron and steel plant in Asia. We also ship to India farm implements and equipment for its machine-building industry; lathes and instruments; mine equipment; and everything necessary for the oil installations, power stations, and other projects it is building with Soviet aid.

Considerable shipping is done to Indo-

nesia, where the Soviet Union is providing technical assistance in building plants and roads.

Large cargoes of equipment and building materials go to the United Arab Republic. The Aswan high dam alone accounted for more than 200,000 tons of equipment and building materials. Many items are shipped to the United Arab Republic for the metallurgical, machine building, chemical and textile plants being built with Soviet assistance.

More and more freighters leave the U.S.S.R. for Ghana, Guinea, Morocco, Somalia, and other African States, as well as for several of the Latin American countries.

They return from the developing Afro-Asian and Latin American countries with their holds filled with such items as rubber, wool, cotton, sugar, coffee, cocoa beans, tea, fruit, oil-bearing seeds, spices, food, and light industry goods.

In recent years Soviet shipping to capitalist countries has grown markedly. Ten years ago it amounted to 3.8 million tons, but by 1964 the figure had risen to 52.7 million. Soviet ships handle 21.6 million tons of these cargoes, and 31.1 million tons are delivered by foreign vessels. As you see, foreign ship-owners can hardly complain that their ships handle too small a share of Soviet freight.

Speaking of the increased turnover of sea-borne cargoes, I should note that the items carried have changed greatly in recent years. Not too long ago the bulk of our export cargoes comprised raw materials, whereas today we carry a great deal of technical equipment, plants and factories ready for assembling, machines of various kinds, metal structures, lathes and precision instruments. We now ship more than 5 million tons of machines, equipment, metals and metal goods a year.

Question. The Soviet merchant marine plays a very considerable role in the country's distribution system, I take it.

Answer. Very considerable. In the overall freight turnover of domestic deliveries the merchant marine holds second place, and its share is growing. The importance of domestic deliveries made by ship is not shown merely by the bulk of cargo. Bear in mind that our coastline is more than double the length of the country's land borders. The shores of the Soviet Union are washed by the waters of 2 oceans and 14 seas, so it is quite obvious what shipping means to Soviet coastal areas. Last year alone our coastal freighters delivered more than 30 million tons of dry cargo and as much liquid cargo.

Our merchant marine is especially important to the people and industries of the northern and far eastern coastal regions. Seafaring vessels in these areas are practically the only means for transporting bulky cargoes. Industry, agriculture, and the general welfare of the population in many parts of the maritime territory, the shores of the Okhotsk Sea, and the regions around them, in many parts of Sakhalin, Kamchatka, Chukotka, and the far north depend on shipping.

The volume of shipping to the Arctic regions is growing by leaps and bounds. Powerful new icebreakers like the *Lenin*, the world's first nuclear-powered surface vessel, keep the sea lanes of the north polar route open in the coldest weather, thus prolonging the period of Arctic navigation. This route has now become a regular seaway along which hundreds of ships make their passage every year. Within a few years we will need a larger fleet of icebreakers, including nuclear-powered vessels built at Soviet shipyards, the way traffic along the northern route is growing.

Question. Vessels with modern technical equipment, including nuclear installations, must require highly qualified seamen. How do you train them?

Answer. For training you need free time and good working conditions. Our merchant